

I am very disturbed by the news that Sinclair Broadcasting plans to pre-empt regularly scheduled broadcasting and requiring that all of its stations show the anti-Kerry documentary. I even wonder if this might be a covert violation of campaign contribution restrictions.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

At the very least, Sinclair should be required to show documentaries that are pro-Kerry and those that are pro-Nader, in the interest of Americans and in order to retain an image of being impartial and unbiased.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.